

Persistence, as used in the specification and claims, has a meaning and usage different from LaStrange's meaning and use of the term.]

LaStrange teaches persistence by way of a symbol or switch 52 having two states corresponding to persistence being on or off (col. 3:52-55). LaStrange's persistence applies to selecting a hyper link in a first web page (col. 3:62-64). When LaStrange's persistence is on, an "operation 92 opens a new window in the browser for display of the new web page" (col. 5:23-24). As stated by LaStrange, persistence is achieved "[b]ecause a new window was created, the first page of the browser displayed at operation 70 (FIG. 6A) is maintained within the computer display" (col. 5:27-29).

This is not what is claimed.

Claimed embodiments do not maintain persistence through opening a second information browser. Instead, as recited in the claims, both the first data and the second data are displayed in one information browser. Further, unlike LaStrange, receiving a second request identifying second data on a second host is not constrained to requests incident to clicking on a hyper link (col. 3:62-64). Any operation that generates the second request, e.g., clicking the forward or backward buttons, entering an address in the address bar, clicking a hyper link, executing a script (e.g., JavaScript, VBScript, etc.), results in the persistent display of the first data and the second data.

To facilitate understanding distinctions between claimed embodiments and LaStrange, the Examiner's attention is directed towards the following exemplary passages from the specification that discuss the claimed persistency:

When enabled, persistency control logic 240 registers itself with browser 210 to receive events originated by web browser 210 which include the web page identifiers input to browser 210. Additionally, persistency control logic 240 conditionally prevents browser 210 from replacing the current display with newly identified HTML documents. In one embodiment, persistency control 240 intervenes in the display of newly requested data such that the new data is co-displayed with the previously received data, thereby providing display persistency. Persistency control logic 240, when enabled, monitors the data requests input to network browser 210. In the case of the world wide web, these data requests are web page identifiers, also referred to as URLs. Web page identifiers can be input to browser 210 in any of a wide variety of conventional manners, including a user typing in a specific identifier, hitting a "Back" or "Forward" button, selecting an identifier from a list of "favorites", selecting a link in an HTML document, etc.

According to one embodiment of the present invention, the portion of the received data which persists in the web browser is that data corresponding to a dynamic page, also referred to as an Internet application. All information related to the Internet application, including controls and data such as application-specific executable code, application-specific HTML content, and application-specific scripts are maintained by the client system. Persistency control 240 effectively "locks" this information into the client system, thereby preventing it from being erased when a new web page is loaded. In other words, rather than allowing browser 210 to clear the entire display, the persistency control 240 intervenes and in cooperation with augmented browser control 260 displays the new data in an "unlocked" portion of the browser's display window.

Persistency control logic 240 initiates augmented browser control 260 when persistency control logic 240 is enabled. Augmented browser control 260 retrieves and displays the newly requested web pages at the request of persistency control logic 240. Together, the "locked" and "unlocked" portions allow web pages from two independent non-collaborating web servers to be displayed concurrently. Thus, the web page from a first page source persists and the user is able to continue to interact with the persisting web page even though web pages from different sources are being retrieved and browsed.

Specification 11:412:14.

Thus, it should be clear while LaStrage uses the term "persistency," LaStrange uses the term in a manner very different from what is disclosed and claimed as embodiments of the invention.

These deficiencies of LaStrange are not cured through combination with Allen. The cited portions of Allen do not teach the recited persistency, nor does a cursory review of Allen reference suggest the claimed persistency. Applicant submits that LaStrange and Allen, whether considered individually, or one in combination with the other, do not render obvious claims 1 and 43.


Regarding dependant claims 29-42, 44-54, applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering the dependent claims. However, in order to focus examination on the issue of persistence, these dependent claims are not being individually addressed at this time; applicant believes they are allowable for at least the reason of depending from allowable base claims.

Thus, passage to issuance of claims 28-54 is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 20, 2002



Steven D. Yates
Patent Attorney
Intel Corporation
Registration No. 42,242
(503) 264-6589

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026